



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/717,645	11/21/2000	Steven J. Kruy	MSFT-05581/140709.1	9553

7590 01/20/2004

STEVEN J ROCCI  
WOODCOCK WASHBURN KURTZ MACKIEWCZ & NORRIS LLP  
ONE LIBERTY PLACE-46TH FLOOR  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER
----------

AL HASHEMI, SANA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 01/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/717,645

Applicant(s)

KRUY ET AL.

Examiner

Sana Al-Hashemi

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 November 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

**Claim Status: 1-7, and 9-24, are rejected.**

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, and 9-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/29/2003 has been entered.

#### ***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Co-pending Application data need to be update at page 1, Specification. Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1- 7, 9-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eisenberg et al. (US Patent No. 5,890,166) in view of Parker et al. (US Patent No. 6,366,930).

1. Regarding Claims 1, and 9, Eisenberg discloses a computerized method for maintaining versions of project data, the project data, having at least one project data attribute, the method comprising (see column 29, lines 23-26, Eisenberg):

receiving an updated value for the project data attribute (see column 5, lines 12-15, Eisenberg);

Eisenberg does not clearly teach the step of saving a previous version of the project data, wherein the previous version contains a value of the at least one project data attribute prior to the update. However, Parker teaches the step of saving a previous version of the project data, wherein the previous version contains a value of the at least one project data attribute prior to the update (see column 4, lines 38-40, Parker). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method of saving previous version instead of freezing the previous version as taught by Eisenberg and the motivation would be to do so is to provide a full record with all its versions to the end users which in other words provides all information existed for each project (see column 5, lines 23-27, Eisenberg);

creating a current version of the project data, wherein the current version of the project data contains the updated value (see column 5, lines 28-35, Eisenberg).

Art Unit: 2171

2. Regarding Claims 2, and 10, the combination of Eisenberg and Parker discloses a computerized method wherein saving a previous version of the project data includes setting an end time field in a first data structure to a value a current time (see column 5, lines 39-41, Eisenberg);

wherein creating a current version of the project data includes the tasks of:

creating a second data structure (see column 15, lines 17-20, Eisenberg);

setting a start time field in the second data structure to a value comprising the current time used to set the end time field of the first data structure (see column 15, lines 27-29, Eisenberg);

setting an end time field in the second data structure to a value representing a most recent version of the object (see column 15, lines 17-20, Eisenberg).

3. Regarding Claims 3, and 11, the combination of Eisenberg and Parker discloses a computerized method further comprising setting a property value field to the updated value (see column 19, lines 46-49, Eisenberg).

4. Regarding Claims 4, 5, 12, and 13, the combination of Eisenberg and Parker discloses a computerized method wherein the value representing the most recent value is a blank or null value (see column 19, lines 42-45, Eisenberg).

5. Regarding Claims 6, 7, 14, 15, and 18, the combination of Eisenberg and Parker discloses a computerized method wherein the data structure comprises at least one row in a database and the database is a relational database (see column 13, lines 37-46, Eisenberg)

6. Regarding Claim 8, the combination of Eisenberg and Parker discloses a computer-readable medium having a data structure stored thereon, the medium comprising:

Art Unit: 2171

a first field comprising an identifier for a project data issue (see column 15, lines 1-2, Eisenberg);

a second field comprising a start time (see column 15, lines 17-20, Eisenberg);

a third field comprising an end time (see column 19, lines 16-18, Eisenberg);

a fourth field comprising a project data property value for the project data issue (see column 19, lines 42-50, Eisenberg); and

wherein the second and third field define a range of time that the project data property value for the project data issue identified by the first field has the project data property value in the fourth field (see column 19, lines 8-15, Eisenberg).

7. Regarding Claim 16, the combination of Eisenberg and Parker discloses a computerized system comprising:

a processor and a computer-readable medium;

an operating environment executing on the processor from the computer-readable medium; and

a project tracking system operative to maintain versions of data associated with a project, the data associated with a project including a project data element (see column 18, lines 10-20, Eisenberg).

8. Regarding Claim 17, the combination of Eisenberg and Parker discloses a computerized system wherein the project tracking system comprises:

a visual interface operative to display the data associated with the project and receive an update to the project data element (see column 13, lines 9-17, Eisenberg);

Art Unit: 2171

a project database operative to store a new version of data associated with a project upon receipt of an update to the project data element (see column 18, lines 35-38, Eisenberg).

9. Regarding Claim 19, the combination of Eisenberg and Parker discloses a method for displaying a property value for a version of project data, the method comprising:

determining a selected version of the project data (see column 4, lines 57-60, Parker);

reading a selected property value for the selected version (see column 4, lines 52-56, Parker );

reading a second property value for at least one other version of project data (see column 4, lines 61-67, Parker);

comparing the selected property value to the second property value (see column 4, lines 21-23, parker);.

Claims 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eisenberg et al. (US Patent No. 5,890,166) in view of Parker et al. (US Patent No. 6,366,930) and further in view of Bereiter et al (US Patent No. 5,917,492).

10. Regarding Claims 20, 21, and 22, the combination of Eisenberg and Parker does not explicitly disclose if the selected property value and the second property value are different, then highlighting the selected property value. However, Bereiter et al. discloses the method of highlighting the selected property value. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to modify/add the highlighting the selected property value to the Eisenberg invention with the motivation of making it attract the user attention to the most recent updates.

Art Unit: 2171

11. Regarding Claims 23, and 24, the combination of Eisenberg and Parker in view of Bereiter discloses the method wherein highlighting the selected property value includes providing a predetermined background color for the selected property value, providing a predetermined background color for the selected property value, displaying a glyph beside the selected property (see column 8, lines 34-67, Bereiter). Bereiter does not disclose the displaying of the selected property value in a strike-through font, displaying a squiggle under the selected property, blinking the selected property value. However. It would have been obvious to add the strike-through font, displaying a squiggle under the selected property, blinking to the selected property value with the motivation they are well known, comment, and efficient way to draw the attention.

### ***Conclusion***

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.



Art Unit: 2171

*Points of Contact*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sana Al-Hashemi whose telephone number is (703) 305-4881. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (703) 308-1436. Any response to this office action should be mailed to: The Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. Or telefax at phone number (703) 872-9306. For formal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT". Hand-delivered response should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor Receptionist, Arlington, Virginia. 22202.

---

Sana Al-Hashemi  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2100  
January 7, 2004

  
SAFET METJAHIC  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100